



672-2617
#26
5/30/01
JD

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Reissue Application of:

ROGER J. LEYDEN ET AL

Ser. No.: 08/807,120

(U.S. Pat. 5,552,771, issued 9/13/96)

Filed: 2/19/97

) RETRACTABLE SENSOR
) FOR AN ALARM SYSTEM
)
)
)

) Art Unit: 2617
)
)

) Examiner: A. Wong
)

RECEIVED

MAY 16 2001

Technology Center 200

RESPONSE AND COMMENTS ON EXAMINER'S
STATEMENT OF REASONS FOR ALLOWANCE

Commissioner for Patents
Washington, D.C. 20231

Sir:

In the March 13, 2001 Office Action, the Examiner has indicated that all claims have been allowed. Surrender of the original patent has been required by the Examiner. The original patent is being submitted herewith.

Applicant's undersigned attorney wishes to thank Examiner Wong for the courtesies extended him during a telephone interview on April 12, 2001. During the interview, certain language in the Statement of Reasons for Allowance was clarified by the Examiner. Specifically, on page 3, on line 13, there is reference to the alarm system as typically having "numerous wires instead of one". The Examiner clarified that what was referenced was that a phone would typically have only one cord associated with it whereas an alarm system might have numerous sensors separately wired from the alarm system to secure separate items.

In the next sentence, the Examiner talks about the alarm system as having to be "substantially more durable". The Examiner explained that durability was discussed in the

37 CFR 1.8

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Assistant Commissioner of Patents, Washington, D.C. 20231 on 5-11-01 (Date)

J. Craine
Signature
J. Craine
Typed or Printed Name of Person Signing

context of the disclosure in U.S. Patent No. 5,124,685 (Rankin). More specifically, in column 1, beginning at line 54 of Rankin, the possibility of electrical shock is discussed. The Examiner indicated that Rankin suggests the possibility of wire fraying in security system environments without the wire being eotjerwound and retracted. The Examiner indicated that this statement was made only to point out that one reading Rankin would likely assume that the likelihood of fraying is even greater in the event that the wire is retracted and wound. The Examiner indicated that it was not his intention with this language to indicate that the wire used in the claimed system must be more durable than telephone or any other wire.

Since all other issues have been addressed, it is respectfully requested that a formal Notice of Allowance be issued in this case.

Respectfully submitted,



John S. Mortimer, Reg. No. 30,407

WOOD, PHILLIPS, VANSANTEN,
CLARK & MORTIMER
500 W. Madison St., Suite 3800
Chicago, IL 60661
(312) 876-1800

Date: May 11, 2001